

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
08/845,897	04/28/1997	M. ASHRAF IMAM	77897USI	77897USI 8846	
26384 7	590 09/19/2006		EXAMINER		
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS) CODE 1008.2 4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320			VO, I	VO, HAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771	1771	
			. DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/845,897	IMAM ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Hai Vo	1771

Advisory Action	08/845,897 IMAM ET AL.						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Hai Vo	1771					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In 							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	Niance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ne of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since				
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	0001180				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		-					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wil vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,11 and 17-28</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5,6,8-10 and 12-1	<u>16</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a 1).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As indicated in box 9 above, the affidavit will not be entered because the affidavit failed to overcome all rejections. It is noted that the present invention was reduced to practice prior to a critical date and the showing is sufficient to overcome the art rejections based on JP 08-245810. However, the claimed subject matter is not fully supported by the showing, namely the vol % of the foam. The showing discloses the composite was made from 6-8% density Al foam. Likewise, the composite had about 92 to 94% vol % polymeric matrix. On the other hand, the claims recite 60 to 95 volume % polymeric matrix, which is not commensurate in scope with the declaration. The claims contain subject matter whose volume % range is much broader than the range described in the declaration.

Hai Vo

HAIVO PRIMARY EXAMINER